REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano et al. (US 6,320,629) in view of Kwak (US 6,384,878), Gu et al. (US 6,359,672), and Watanabe et al. (US 2003/0086041).

Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano et al. in view of Nakamura et al. (US 6,582,862).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, and 12 to further define the invention, and have amended claims 12 and 15 to correct minor informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 12-16 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano et al. (US 6,320,629) in view of Kwak (US 6,384,878), Gu et al. (US 6,359,672), and Watanabe et al. (US 2003/0086041), and claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano et al. in view of Nakamura et al. (US 6,582,862). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Initially, Applicants respectfully assert that a Claim for Priority and a Certified copy of Korean Patent Application No. 2002-0066787 was filed on September 30, 2003. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.55(a), Applicants submit concurrently herewith a verified translation of Korean Patent Application No. 2002-0066787 to establish the earlier date of invention for the Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Watanabe et al. must be withdrawn as prior art since the priority date of Watanabe et al. is October 22, 2001.

Independent claims 1, 3, and 12, as amended, recite a liquid crystal display device and method of forming a liquid crystal display device including the specific feature of a compensation film "formed in a pixel region." Applicants respectfully assert that none of the applied prior art describes a compensation film within the pixel region. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the prior art of record renders the presently claimed invention obvious.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that none of Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al., and Nakamura et al., whether taken singly or in combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1-4 and 12-16. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-4 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this Response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: June 26, 2007

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000